

DD/S 72-1265

31 MAR 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Training

SUBJECT : Comments on OTR Draft Paper, "Training and Career Development"

REFERENCE : OTR Draft (sent to ADD/S 20 Mar 72)

Rod:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on your draft paper. Aside from some relatively minor criticisms described later, I have only one problem. I am not convinced, as apparently you are, that sanctions are undesirable. In fact, sanctions seem to be justified when we realize that only half of all professionals entering on duty in FY 1971 attended the Intelligence and World Affairs Course even though it is required by HR [REDACTED] Un-
doubtedly, part of the problem is that the regulation does not provide a sanc-
tion for those who do not comply with it. Except in cases where waivers are
justified, I am inclined to favor a sanction that would prohibit even an in-grade
raise until the IWA is completed. While I have my doubts about sanctions at
the midcareer level, I must reluctantly admit that it may be the only way to
ensure that the majority of our employees receive the core courses described
in your paper. In any event, this subject requires discussion among OTR, OP,
and O-DD/S officers, and later, among the Deputies. Incidentally, I notice on
page 9, paragraph 2, of referent memorandum that reference is made to
HR [REDACTED] in the context that it contains an "already existing sanction." While
the IWA predecessor courses are required by regulation, I am unable to iden-
tify a sanction for failure to comply.

25X1A

25X1A

In discussing the midcareer core courses, such as the Advanced Intelligence Seminar (AIS) and the Midcareer Course (MC), I cannot help but wonder how we can propose these as required midcareer training yet imply that OTR can only train 100 in the AIS and 128 in the MC. As you have pointed out elsewhere, the present OTR student load capability for yearly mid-career training is substantially below the number of employees who become eligible each year for such training. Since OTR certainly cannot expect to increase its ceiling, I wonder how you would train the additional eligible employees with existing resources, assuming core midcareer courses become mandatory.

Page 7, paragraph 2 -- I was under the impression that OTR does control student acceptance which in effect controls selection, particularly in the AIS. Perhaps this should be clarified in your paper.


SUBJECT: Comments on OTR Draft Paper, "Training and Career Development"

Page 8, section 5 -- I believe we have to be cautious in making statements about "insufficient resources." While I understand the point you are trying to make, there should probably be an accompanying phrase about maintaining the quality of instruction and use of the most appropriate pedagogical techniques. I think it is rather obvious that any course, given a suitable physical location, can handle additional students by sacrificing quality of instruction. Our emphasis on "insufficient resources" may do us more harm than good.

Page 9, paragraph 3 -- My reaction to the paragraph beginning "Moreover . . ." is that it simply is not a relevant argument against sanctions. I think it detracts from the overall quality of your paper.

Page 13, paragraph 3 -- I believe the FRQ already contains a section on training. Consequently, you may want to rephrase this paragraph to suggest more attention to the subject.

STATINTL



Robert S. Wattles
Assistant Deputy Director
for Support

Att: Ref draft

DD/S 72-1265

31 MAR 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Training

SUBJECT : Comments on OTR Draft Paper, "Training
and Career Development"

REFERENCE : OTR Draft (sent to ADD/S 20 Mar 72)

Rod:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on your draft paper. Aside from some relatively minor criticisms described later, I have only one problem. I am not convinced, as apparently you are, that sanctions are undesirable. In fact, sanctions seem to be justified when we realize that only half of all professionals entering on duty in FY 1971 attended the Intelligence and World Affairs Course even though it is required by HR [REDACTED]. Undoubtedly, part of the problem is that the regulation does not provide a sanction for those who do not comply with it. Except in cases where waivers are justified, I am inclined to favor a sanction that would prohibit even an in-grade raise until the IWA is completed. While I have my doubts about sanctions at the midcareer level, I must reluctantly admit that it may be the only way to ensure that the majority of our employees receive the core courses described in your paper. In any event, this subject requires discussion among OTR, OP, and O-DD/S officers, and later, among the Deputies. Incidentally, I notice on page 9, paragraph 2, of referent memorandum that reference is made to HR [REDACTED] in the context that it contains an "already existing sanction." While the IWA predecessor courses are required by regulation, I am unable to identify a sanction for failure to comply.

25X1A

25X1A

*in the
t - we
it!*

In discussing the midcareer core courses, such as the Advanced Intelligence Seminar (AIS) and the Midcareer Course (MC), I cannot help but wonder how we can propose these as required midcareer training yet imply that OTR can only train 100 in the AIS and 128 in the MC. As you have pointed out elsewhere, the present OTR student load capability for yearly midcareer training is substantially below the number of employees who become eligible each year for such training. Since OTR certainly cannot expect to increase its ceiling, I wonder how you would train the additional eligible employees with existing resources, assuming core midcareer courses become mandatory.

not this

*after
hand -
value*

Page 7, paragraph 2 -- I was under the impression that OTR does control student acceptance which in effect controls selection, particularly in the AIS. Perhaps this should be clarified in your paper.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Comments on OTR Draft Paper, "Training and Career Development"

Page 8, section 5 -- I believe we have to be cautious in making statements about "insufficient resources." While I understand the point you are trying to make, there should probably be an accompanying phrase about maintaining the quality of instruction and use of the most appropriate pedagogical techniques. I think it is rather obvious that any course, given a suitable physical location, can handle additional students by sacrificing quality of instruction. Our emphasis on "insufficient resources" may do us more harm than good.

think it is very relevant

Page 9, paragraph 3 -- My reaction to the paragraph beginning "Moreover . . ." is that it simply is not a relevant argument against sanctions. I think it detracts from the overall quality of your paper.

Page 13, paragraph 3 -- I believe the FRQ already contains a section on training. Consequently, you may want to rephrase this paragraph to suggest more attention to the subject.

/s/ Robert S. Wattles

Robert S. Wattles
Assistant Deputy Director
for Support

Att: Ref draft

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~